

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 6, 7, and 8. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 6, 7, and 8, replace the original sheets including Figures 6, 7, and 8.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, and 13 are currently amended. Claim 14 is cancelled. No claims are newly added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the Replacement Sheets, Applicant has inserted the legend "Prior Art" in Figures 6, 7, and 8. Accordingly, the objection should now be rendered moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to recite "a similar small-region spectrogram detection portion which detects a small-region stored signal spectrogram similar to. . ." This change is made in order to clarify whether a "small region spectrogram" is the small region spectrogram of the stored signal or the reference signal.

Further, regarding Claim 1, the original claim includes "a degree of segment similarity calculation portion which uses a degree of small-region similarity of a small-region stored signal spectrogram similar to the small-region reference signal

spectrogram in detected stored signal spectrograms.” Here, “a degree of segment similarity calculation portion” uses “a degree of small-region similarity.” The degree of small-region similarity is the similarity between “a small-region stored signal spectrogram” and “the small-region reference signal spectrogram,” and such “a small-region stored signal spectrogram” is included “in detected stored signal spectrograms.” In Claim 1, Applicant seeks to clarify that “detected stored signal spectrograms” are small-region spectrograms included in the stored signals.

In addition, Applicant has noted a few redundant expressions in Claim 1 that should be corrected. Therefore, Applicant amends the claim to read: “A detection system of a segment including a specific sound signal ~~detects a segment including sounds similar to a reference signal that is a specific sound signal from stored signals, comprising~~” and “~~the detection system of a segment including a specific sound signal detects the segment including a sound in the stored signals similar to the reference signal based on the degree of segment similarity.~~” Claim 7 is also amended to resolve the same problem. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 is amended so as to include technical features of Claim 7 and so as to be in a form of a software claim, and Claim 14 is cancelled. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kashino et al., "A quick search algorithm for acoustic signals using histogram features-time-series active search," Electronics & Communications in Japan, Part III – Fundamental Electronic Science, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ US Vol. 84, No. 12, Part 3, December 2001, pp. 40-47 ("Kashino"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding Claim 1, the Examiner states that the claim is disclosed in Kashino. However, Applicant disagrees since Kashino, in "2.3 Feature modeling by means of a histogram," for example, clearly states that a histogram overlap rate is used. Page 9 of the specification of the present application states:

The prior art detects the similarity between two small-region spectrograms based on the overlapping ratio of the histogram, however, the present invention detects only the similarity after encoding two small-region spectrograms, therefore, it is possible to reduce the amount of calculation greatly compared to the prior art and it is possible to detect the segment including a specific sound signal at high speed.

Kashino cannot produce such an advantage. Therefore, Applicant maintains that it is not possible for a person of ordinary skill in the art to conceive the present application from Kashino. Applicant asserts that other claims are allowable for the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 7 and 13 should be allowable by applying the same arguments in favor of Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 1-13 represent patentable subject

matter over Kashino. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 18, 2010

By: /Gregory A. Stobbs/_____
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/dec

15834413.1